UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,807	04/20/2001	Michael T. Brown	10011540-1	3525

7590	08/05/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KLIMACH, PAULA W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-7,9-11,13,16,18 and 20-34* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, 20-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 07/20/2005. The amendment

filed on 07/20/05 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are

1, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, and 20-34.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07/20/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive because of following reasons.

The applicant argued, "as was noted in the previous office action, no patent application

number has been identified by the Examiner for the Schneier reference, which was used to reject

applicant's original claim 4". The reference of Schneier is a textbook "Applied Cryptography,"

whose copies of the applicable pages have been provided.

Applicant argued that providing the user code to the web site host when the user visits a

web site maintained by the web site host. This is not found persuasive. Applicant defines user

code as identifying the user to the website as a participant in the information sharing e-service.

The access level performs the function of the user code by identifying the user level of access

and therefore identifying the user as a participant.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the requested

information (not a user code) is provided to the web site by an applet executing on the user

(emphasis added)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The applicant argued further that Rowland does not disclose receiving, from the web site host, a request for information concerning the user and the user code that was provided to the web site host. This is not persuasive. In column 5 lines 22-26 Rowland discloses a website host requesting the user information which in turn makes the browser find the access level (user code; column 5 lines 27-45). In the combination of Rowland and Jones the browser of Rowland would receive the access code sent by the remote device as in Jones.

The applicant argued further that Rowland determining a level of access for which the web site host is authorized from the user code received from the web site host. The access level is used to determine the level of access of information (column 6 lines 28-35).

Finally the applicant Rowland does not teach transmitting user information to the web site host that pertains to the user code. In column 6 line 36-57 the applicant specify the content of the user info sent to the website, therefore the "notice of exceeding access limit ofs information" is based on the access level (user code).

The examiner asserts that the combination of Rowland and Jones does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent Claims 1, 16, 27, and 31. Dependent Claims 4-7, 9-11, 13, 18, 20-26, 28-30, and 32-34 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 16, 18, and 20-34 are respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 16-18, 27-28, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rowland et al (EP 0 844 767 A1) in view of Jones et al (5,623,637).

In reference to claims 1, 16, 27, and 31, Rowland discloses a method for sharing user

information, comprising (abstract): receiving from a user an identification of a level of access

that is to be extended to a web site host (column 5 lines 14-23); assigning a user code to the web

site host when the user visits a web site maintained by the web site host (Fig. 6) and providing

the user code to the web site host when the user visits a web site maintained by the web site host

(Fig. 7 part 711); receiving form the web site host a request for information concerning the user

and the name of the server (column 6 lines 24-32); determining a level of access for which the

web site host is authorized from the user code received form the web site host (column 6 lines

50-54); and transmitting user information to the web site host that pertains to the user code (part

712 Fig. 7).

Although Rowland discloses a process to determine the level of access available to the

web site, Rowland does not disclose a system wherein the browser receives an access code to

determine the level of access.

Jones discloses a system, that wants to gain access to data, sends an access code that is

used to determine the level of access available (column 9 lines 1-21).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to replace the name of the website, provided in the website information request, with the access code as in the system of Jones for determining the level of access in Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would reduce the number of steps required for determining access and therefore increase the response speed.

In reference to claims 5 and 18, wherein the step of determining the level of access comprises comparing the user code provided by the web site host with a user code assigned to the user and relevant to a particular user information set (column 5 lines 55-58).

In reference to claim 7 wherein the step of transmitting user information comprises transmitting user profile information while withholding personal information about the user (Fig. 6).

In reference to claim 22, wherein receiving an identification of a level of access comprises receiving selection of one of an anonymous mode in which only profile information and no personal information is provided, and a full disclosure mode in which profile information and personal information is provided (column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 7).

In reference to claim 23 wherein receiving an identification of a level of access further comprises receiving user selection of a category of information to share (Fig. 5).

In reference to claim 24, wherein receiving user selection of a category comprises receiving user selection of at least one of a personal category a business category, and a financial category.

In reference to claim 25, wherein assigning a user code comprises assigning a first code pertinent to an initial level of access to be provided to the web site host and a second code pertinent to a deeper level of access that can be manually provided by the user if desired.

Although Rowland discloses assigning codes to websites that are possibly assigned manually, Rowland does not disclose assigning he second code pertinent to a deeper level of.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add more levels of code pertinent to deeper levels of access in the system Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow greater control on the amount of access.

In reference to claims 26, 28, and 32, wherein providing the user code comprises automatically providing the first user code to the web site host when the user visits the web site, and providing the second user code to the web site host if the user chooses to so provide the second user code.

Although Rowland discloses assigning codes to websites that are possibly assigned manually or automatically, Rowland does not disclose assigning he second code pertinent to a deeper level of.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add more levels of code pertinent to deeper levels of access in the system Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow greater control on the amount of access.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Schneier.

In reference to the user code comprises a transient key. A transient key is a key that expires after a period of time.

Rowland does not expressly disclose the code that was designated by the user comprising a transient key.

Schneier teaches that a key should expire automatically; therefore a system should have a policy that determines the permitted lifetime of a key (pages 183-184).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a code that expires after a certain period of time as disclosed in Schneier in the system of Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the longer the code is used the greater the chance that the system will be compromised.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Henrick et al (6,055,510).

Regarding transmitting user information from a centralized repository which stores user information for a plurality of users.

Rowland does not expressly disclose transmitting the user information from a centralized repository that stores user information fro a plurality of users.

Henrick discloses a system and method of storing user information in a centralized repository (column 4 lines 32-37) and transmitting the user information from this centralized repository to a website (particular advertiser; column 4 line 66 to column 5 line 10)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use a central repository to store the user information and transmit the user

information to the host website. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do

this because the ISP can take advantage of the unique customer knowledge with respect to user

likes and dislikes, while preserving the privacy of the customer, to attract businesses with interest

in customer bases.

Claims 9, 11, 13, 20-21, 29, 30, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rowland in view of Davis et al (6,367,009 B1)

In reference to claims 13, 19, 30, and 34, Rowland discloses a method for acquiring user

information that is used to personalize a web site for the user (column 1 lines 1-30 in

combination with abstract).

Although Rowland discloses the website host requesting user information (column 6 lines

12-15), Rowland does not disclose the user information being stored at centralized repository and

providing the user code to the centralized repository.

Davis discloses the ETS that is a relational database manager (centralized repository

storing) that stores user information needed by the intermediate MTS (website server; column 9

lines 24-48). The client delegates authentication to the MTS to retrieve the user information.

The MTS uses the certificate chain, which includes information from the client certificate that

was provided by the client (column 13 lines 1-58), this performs the function of providing

authentication and code required by the ETS (column 14 lines 14-40) to authenticate the MTS

and provide the user information (column 9 lines 25-48 in combination with column 13 lines 53-58). This is the function of the user code sent to the website host.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a central repository to store the user information and transmit the user information to the host website. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the ISP can take advantage of the unique customer knowledge with respect to user likes and dislikes, while preserving the privacy of the customer, to attract businesses with interest in customer bases.

In reference to claims 9 and 20, wherein providing a web site host with the user code comprises automatically providing the user code when the user visits the web site (column 6 lines36-44).

In reference to claims 11 and 21 wherein providing a web site host with the user code comprises providing the user code to the web site host that is manually entered by the user at the web site (column 6 lines 45-51).

In reference to claims 10, 29, and 33, wherein the user code is automatically appended to a uniform resource locator (URL) of the web site.

Rowland and Davis do not expressly disclose the code being appended to the URL of the web site.

However, since Davis discloses sending the certificate as part of a message and Rowland discloses sending the request with the information that the web server requires, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to append

the code to the URL. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this

because it would conserve bandwidth to send it as one message instead of multiple messages.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-3854.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PWK
Wednesday, August 03, 2005

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100